



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/809,625	03/25/2004	Boris Kalinichenko	08575-103001	7474
26161	7590	08/21/2009	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON PC			SIKRI, ANISH	
P.O. BOX 1022				
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2443	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/21/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/809,625	KALINICHENKO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	ANISH SIKRI	2443	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 April 2009.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-32 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 25 March 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

1. **Claims 1-15, 19-23, 25-27, and 29-31** are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nowitz et al (US Pat 7,308,464) hereafter known as Nowitz, in view of Hu (2003/0182408), further in view of Beyer et al (US Pub 20030135487) hereafter known as Beyer.

2. Consider Claim 1, Nowitz et al disclosed a method for validating wireless content comprising: performing a first web crawling process to retrieve a first set of content files from a web site (Nowitz et al, Col 6 Lines 3-15, Nowitz disclosed on how data is harvested from a website), the first web crawling process including identifying a link in a first content file of the first set (Nowitz et al, Col 6 Lines 3-15), and following the link to a second content file of the first set (Nowitz et al, Col 6 Lines 34-67, Nowitz disclosed that the website can be structured and have different levels or organization), the second

Art Unit: 2443

content file including content based on the first content file (Nowitz et al, Col 6 Lines 34-67);

3. But Nowitz et al does not explicitly state analyzing the first set of content files for errors by emulating a first category of devices.

4. Nonetheless, Hu disclosed analyzing the first set of content files for errors by emulating a first category of devices (Hu, [0017], [0021], Hu disclosed on how mobile devices are emulated for testing of data content. Further support can be seen in [0033], [0041]-[0042], Hu disclosed on emulating the mobile devices and how errors can be flagged via detection).

5. Both Nowitz et al and Hu provide features related to content management of data in the network with their various devices/nodes/clients etc. Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings since both are within the same environment.

6. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of emulation of mobile/wireless devices for content data testing, taught by Hu, in the system of Nowitz et al for the purpose of efficient data content management via the aid of emulation of wireless/mobile devices.

7. Also, Nowitz et al does not explicitly state the use of generating a log file including navigation history and error information.

8. Nonetheless, Beyer disclosed the use of generating a log file including navigation history and error information (Beyer, [0042] disclosed on how the logs and history links are processed by the system).

9. Both Nowitz et al and Beyer provide features related to wireless/mobile devices.

Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings since both are within the same environment.

10. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of log file creation, taught by Beyer, in the system of Nowitz et al, for the purpose of efficient data content management with the aid of log information.

11. Consider Claim 2, has similar limitations as Claim 1, therefore it is rejected under the same rational as Claim 1.

12. Consider Claim 3, Nowitz-Hu-Beyer discloses the method of claim 2, wherein, Nowitz discloses wherein the analyzing content comprises: identifying a first list of language elements (Nowitz et al, Col 4 Lines 37-40, Nowitz disclosed the use of markup languages) that are supported by the first category of wireless devices (Hu [0017], [0021], Hu disclosed on how mobile devices are emulated for testing of data content); and performing a syntax check of the first set of content files using the elements (Nowitz et al, Col 6 Lines 3-15).

13. Consider Claim 4, has similar limitations as Claim 3, therefore it is rejected under the same rational as Claim 3.

14. Consider Claim 5, has similar limitations as Claim 1, therefore it is rejected under the same rational as Claim 1.

15. Consider Claim 6, has similar limitations as Claim 1, therefore it is rejected under the same rational as Claim 1.

16. Consider Claim 7, has similar limitations as Claim 1, therefore it is rejected under the same rational as Claim 1.

17. Consider Claim 8, has similar limitations as Claim 1, therefore it is rejected under the same rational as Claim 1.

18. Consider Claim 9, has similar limitations as Claim 3, therefore it is rejected under the same rational as Claim 3.

19. Consider Claim 10, has similar limitations as Claim 3, therefore it is rejected under the same rational as Claim 3.

20. Consider Claim 11 has similar limitations as Claim 1, therefore it is rejected under the same rational as Claim 1.

Art Unit: 2443

21. Consider Claim 12, has similar limitations as Claim 1, therefore it is rejected under the same rational as Claim 1.

22. Consider Claim 13, Nowitz-Hu-Beyer disclosed the method of claim 1, wherein the navigation history (Beyer, [0042] disclosed on how the logs and history links are processed by the system) identifies an order in which the first set of content files are retrieved (Nowitz et al, Col 9 Lines 65-67, Col 10 Lines 1-15, Nowitz et al disclosed on how the agent captures the data from the web)

23. Consider Claim 14, Nowitz-Hu-Beyer disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising: receiving a seed URL that defines a starting point for the first web crawling process (Nowitz et al, Col 6 Lines 3-15, Nowitz et al disclosed on how the system coordinates the crawling process).

24. Consider Claim 15, Nowitz-Hu-Beyer disclosed the method of claim 1, further comprising wherein, Nowitz-Hu disclosed providing a test configuration file including user data (Hu, [0009]-[0010], Hu disclosed the use of a configuration file); and for each retrieved content file (Hu, [0026], [0036], Hu disclosed the use of message files, which aid in the testing) , determining whether the content file has input data fields, and if so, entering the user data in the input data fields and sending the user data to the web site (Hu, [0040], Hu disclosed plethora of testing, which can involve making the user connect to servers etc).

25. Claim 19, has similar limitations as to claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 1.

26. Claim 20, has similar limitations as to claim 2; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 2.

27. Claim 21, has similar limitations as to claim 7; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 7.

28. Claim 22, has similar limitations as to claim 8; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 8.

29. Claim 23, has similar limitations as to claim 15; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 15.

30. Claim 25, has similar limitations as to claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 1.

31. Claim 26, has similar limitations as to claim 2; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 2.

32. Claim 27, has similar limitations as to claim 15; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 1.

33. Claim 29, has similar limitations as to claim 1; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 1.

34. Claim 30, has similar limitations as to claim 2; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 2.

35. Claim 31, has similar limitations as to claim 15; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 15.

36. **Claims 16-18, 24, 28, 32** is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nowitz et al (US Pat 7,308,464) hereafter known as Nowitz, in view of Hu (2003/0182408), further in view of Beyer et al (US Pub 20030135487) hereafter known as Beyer, and in further view of Sheth et al (US Pat 6,311,194) hereafter known as Sheth.

37. Consider Claim 16, Nowitz-Hu-Beyer disclosed the method of claim 15, wherein Hu discloses providing the test configuration file (Hu, [0009]-[0010], Hu disclosed the

use of a configuration file) comprises: fields; receiving input from a user entering user data into the one or more input data fields (Hu, [0040], Hu disclosed plethora of testing, which can involve making the user connect to servers etc); and generating the test configuration file based on the user input (Hu, [0040], Hu disclosed plethora of testing, which can involve making the user connect to servers etc).

38. But Nowitz-Hu-Beyer does not explicitly state displaying a blank form on a screen of a computing device, the blank form having one or more input data.

39. Nonetheless, Sheth disclosed displaying a blank form on a screen of a computing device, the blank form having one or more input data (Sheth, Col 13 Lines 64-67, Col 17 Lines 11-13, Sheth disclosed that the mobile devices can disclose blank forms, as a user may input value/attributes to be inserted in the form)

40. Both Nowitz-Hu-Beyer, and Sheth provide features related to data management on wireless/mobile devices. Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings since both are within the same environment.

41. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the blank form to capture input from the user, taught by Sheth, in the system of Nowitz-Hu-Beyer, for the purpose of obtaining data to be used for data management purposes.

42. Consider Claim 17, Nowitz-Hu-Beyer-Sheth disclosed the method of claim 16, wherein the user data includes one or more variable values that are used to create a

Art Unit: 2443

dynamic URL (Nowitz et al, Col 6 Lines 3-15, Nowitz disclosed that seeds can represents url or links or content in the system).

43. Consider Claim 18, Nowitz-Hu-Beyer disclosed the method of Claim 1, wherein the link includes the first content file (Nowitz et al, Col 6 Lines 3-15).

44. But Nowitz-Hu-Beyer does not explicitly disclose the use of variable values to be incorporated within the file.

45. Nonetheless, Sheth disclosed the use of variable values to be incorporated within the file (Sheth, Col 13 Lines 64-67, Col 17 Lines 11-13, Sheth disclosed that the mobile devices can disclose blank forms, as a user may input value/attributes to be inserted in the form, thus allowing variables to be included)

46. Both Nowitz-Hu-Beyer, and Sheth provide features related to data management on wireless/mobile devices. Therefore one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teachings since both are within the same environment.

47. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate the use of variable values to be used with a file, taught by Sheth, in the system of Nowitz-Hu-Beyer, for the purpose of obtaining data to be used for data management purposes.

48. Claim 24, has similar limitations as to claim 16; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 16.

Art Unit: 2443

49. Claim 28, has similar limitations as to claim 16; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 16.

50. Claim 32, has similar limitations as to claim 16; therefore, it is rejected under the same rational as to claim 16.

51. Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/8/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

52. Claim 1, Applicant argues that combination of Nowitz-Hu-Beyer fails to teach on how the content is displayed correctly on various kinds of mobile devices. Nonetheless, Examiner sees that in Claim 1, there is no mention of content is displayed correctly on various kinds of mobile devices. Below is the current Claim 1.

53. A method for validating wireless content comprising:

54. performing a first web crawling process to retrieve a first set of content files from a web site, the first web crawling process including

55. identifying a link in a first content file of the first set, and

56. following the link to a second content file of the first set, the second content file including content based on the first content file;

57. analyzing the first set of content files for errors by emulating a first category of wireless devices; and

58. generating a log file including a navigation history and error information, wherein the navigation history includes one or more paths of links traversed during the first web crawling process.

59. The listed claim 1 above fails to disclose on where the device displays content correctly in various kinds of devices. As common in the art, emulation is not same has displaying content.

60. Applicant argues that Hu fails to analyze the error in content files. Examiner states that combination of Nowitz-Hu-Beyer does indeed teach on analysis of error in the content files which are emulated in the mobile devices. As Hu states in (Hu, [0017], [0033]) that it does analyze and test information from each session, and if the content data had errors, then the analysis provided by Hu will result in error. Thus combination of Nowitz-Hu-Beyer does indeed teach analysis of error in content files. Further support in Hu can be seen in (Hu, [0035]-[0036] and [0040]). Applicant argues that combination of Nowitz-Hu-Beyer, in which Beyer fails to disclose history of links traversed by web crawling process. Examiner states that Nowitz-Hu-Beyer does indeed teach the use of log file which contains information related to links (Beyer, [0040], Beyer discloses that the a proxy server includes a log of appropriate communications between browsers and web servers resulting from user access to web databases using html, and the log files of proxy server are accessed by web crawler). Thus Beyer clearly discloses web crawler having access to log files which contain valid links.

61. For Claim 3, Applicant states that the combination of Nowitz-Hu-Beyer fails to disclose “identifying a first set of language elements that are supported by the first category of wireless devices”, and how one of ordinary skill in the art would know that

wireless devices can be emulated while load testing a server, and also know to obtain metadata. The combination of Nowitz-Hu-Beyer does provide one with identifying set of language elements supported by the wireless devices. Nowitz discloses the language elements in (Nowitz, Col 4 Lines 37-40, as metadata). And Hu provides wireless devices which use mobile browsers, (Hu, Fig 1, [0003], and it is common in the art that the browsers communicate via markup languages).

62. For Claim 16, and 18, Applicant argues that the combination of Nowitz-Hu-Beyer-Sheth does not make it obvious to a person skilled in the art at the time of the invention as Sheth does not provide a blank form, when filled in, to generate a configuration file. Sheth does provide a blank form which when filled in - will result in a configuration file (Sheth, Col 13 Lines 64-67, Col 17 Lines 11-13, Sheth disclosed that mobile devices can disclose blank forms, as user may input value/attributes to be inserted in the form), and if Sheth provides an interface for a user to input data, then it would be obvious to person skilled in the art that collected data from the user can be used to create a file which further can be passed in the system. Applicant states that in Claim 18, that Sheth does not provide the user to enter variable values in the blank form. Sheth discloses that the user can use variable values such as "OR" and "AND" in the data being entered in the blank form (Sheth, Col 14 Lines 5-14, Lines 41-48).

63. For Claim 17, Applicant argues that Nowitz does not teach that link arrived by the web crawler are dynamic URLs. As Nowitz does teach that the URLs are captured by the web crawler, thus it is common in the art to see that the web crawlers can indeed pick up static URLs and dynamic URLs when crawling for links. And the web crawler

uses a seed to search and retrieve information, thus any URLs can be retrieved based on the configuration desired by the user/system.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANISH SIKRI whose telephone number is 571-270-1783. The examiner can normally be reached on 8am - 5pm Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tonia Dollinger can be reached on 571-272-4170. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Anish Sikri
a.s.

Aug 13, 2009

/Tonia LM Dollinger/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2443